



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,501	06/27/2001	Jun Akikusa	SHG-0047	8796

23353 7590 12/16/2003

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

ALEJANDRO, RAYMOND

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1745

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Applicati n N .

09/891,501

Applicant(s)

AKIKUSA ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Alejandro

Art Unit

1745

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☒ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-6.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.


8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: new matter and new issue: (claim 1) "the specific amount of Co in said first electrolyte layer being 0 to 80 %", it is noted that specification does not provide support for this amendment as the original disclosure in page 5 clearly states that "the amount of Co in the first electrolyte layer is preferably 0 or 80 % less".

It is also noted that applicants provided a computer translation of paragraph 12 and claim 2 of priority document 2000-193750 that was retrieved from the Japanese Patent Office web site, however, (as admitted by the applicants) the computer translation is difficult to interpret with respect to the percentage amounts of cobalt in the first electrolyte compared to the second electrolyte.

In that, applicants further contended that they believed the amount of cobalt in the first electrolyte layer can be translated as 0% to 80 % (i.e. the Co content ranges from 0-80 %, inclusive, see the specific Co range in proposed claim 1) with respect to the amount of cobalt in the second electrolyte layer.

In order to expedite this prosecution and to verify the translation accuracy of paragraph 12 and claim 2 of the priority document 2000-193750, the examiner took the document to a PTO Japanese language translator to check how paragraph 12 and claim 2 can be interpreted and translated. Accordingly, the paragraph 12 and claim 2 were translated by the PTO Japanese language translator as reciting "0 or 80 %" per se. Thus, since applicants admitted that the computer translation is difficult to interpret with respect to the percentage amounts of Co, and the PTO Japanese translator translated the recitation as stated above, the examiner asserts that the proposed amendment raises new issues and the issue of new matter.


Patrick Ryan
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700